

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-44 remain in the present application. Claims 1-2, 9, 18 and 26-27 are amended herein. Claims 31-44 are added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments and additions. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic examiner interview was conducted on April 1, 2008 between Examiner Gregory Vaughn and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito. Independent Claim 1 was discussed with respect to the Sadovnik and McGarry references. No definite agreements were reached. Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 13-30

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 5,764,317 to Sadovnik et al. (hereafter referred to as "Sadovnik") in view of United States Patent Number 6,859,907 to McGarry (hereafter referred to as "McGarry"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 13-30 are not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites one disclosed embodiment related to a method of displaying spreadsheet objects of at least one spreadsheet on a multi-layer display comprising a first display screen and a second display screen comprising (emphasis added):

assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with a first display screen of a multi-component display;

assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with a second display screen of said multi-component display; and

simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with said first and second screen designation codes, wherein said simultaneously displaying comprises generating said first and second spreadsheet objects using at least one pixel of said first display screen and at least one pixel of said second display screen.

Independent Claim 18 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17 and 19-30 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sadovnik fails to teach or suggest the combination of features, including, for example, “wherein said simultaneously displaying comprises generating said first and second spreadsheet objects using at least one pixel of said first display screen and at least one pixel of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, first and second spreadsheet objects are simultaneously displayed on respective display screens (e.g., a first display screen and a second display screen) of a multi-component display. The spreadsheet objects are

generated using at least one pixel of the first display screen and at least one pixel of the second display screen.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Sadovnik to teach projecting images onto various layers (Figures 3 and Figures 4A-4D). For example, Sadovnik teaches that different images are sequentially projected onto different layers (Figures 4A to 4D; col. 7, lines 44-56). Further, Sadovnik teaches that the images are generated by the projector before projection onto the layers (col. 6, lines 26-50). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Sadovnik teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching images that are generated *using a projector* instead of images that are generated *using pixels of a display screen* as claimed.

Additionally, assuming arguendo that the layers taught by Sadovnik are analogous to display screens as claimed, Sadovnik fails to teach or suggest that the layers have pixels as claimed. Instead, Sadovnik teaches that each layer is an electrically switchable polymer dispersed liquid crystal (PDLC) film (col. 7, lines 37-51). Applicants respectfully submit that PDLC films are not display screens as claimed since they do not have pixels as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sadovnik further teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully submit that McGarry, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik, also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features,

including, for example, “wherein said simultaneously displaying comprises generating said first and second spreadsheet objects using at least one pixel of said first display screen and at least one pixel of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 1. For example, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand McGarry to teach different portions of data displayed on the *same* display screen (Figure 2; col. 1, lines 64-67). As such, even assuming arguendo that McGarry teaches generating images using pixels of a single display screen, McGarry still fails to teach or suggest simultaneously displaying multiple spreadsheet objects *using a first and a second display screen* as claimed. Further, McGarry also fails to teach or suggest using at least one pixel *from each display screen* to generate the first and second spreadsheet objects as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that McGarry fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited in independent Claim 1, and further submit that McGarry teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching displaying images on a *single* display screen instead of *multiple* display screens as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of McGarry, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claim 18 recites limitations similar to those of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 18 also overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since dependent Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17 and 19-30 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims

2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-17 and 19-30 are also not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of McGarry. Therefore, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 13-30 are allowable.

Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik and further in view of “Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition” by Courter et al (hereafter referred to as “Courter”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3 and 8 are not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik and further in view of Courter for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Courter, either alone or in combination with Sadovnik and/or McGarry, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Sadovnik/McGarry combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Courter also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features, including, for example, “wherein said simultaneously displaying comprises generating said first and second spreadsheet objects using at least one pixel of said first display screen and at least one pixel of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 3 and 8 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claims 3 and 8 are not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of McGarry and further in view of Courter. Thus, Claims 3 and

8 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

New Claims 31-44

Newly-added independent Claim 31 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that newly-added independent Claim 31 is not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of McGarry for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Since newly-added Claims 32-44 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 31, dependent Claims 32-44 are also not rendered obvious by Sadovnik in view of McGarry. Thus, newly-added Claims 31-44 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-10 and 13-44 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 5 / 5 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060